



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,010	03/24/2001	Mark B. Lyles	068986.0105	5741

7590 11/05/2003

Baker Botts L.L.P.
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana
Houston, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER

JOYNES, ROBERT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,010

Applicant(s)

LYLES, MARK B.

Examiner

Robert M. Joynes

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,12-23 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's Amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed on September 17, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 7-11, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lyles et al. (US 5621035). Lyles teaches a composition comprising about 1% to about 50% by weight alumina, about 50% to about 98% by weight silica, and about 1% to about 5% by weight boron (Col. 3, lines 14-22). The composition further comprises silicon carbide (Col. 12, Claim 13). The density of the composition ranges from 4 lb./ft³ to 62 lb./ft³ (Col. 3, lines 30-63). The composition is also highly porous (Col. 3, lines 30-63). Carbon fibers are also added to the composition (Col. 4, lines 37-67).

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lyles et al. (US 5951295). Lyles teaches a composition comprising about 1% to about 50% by weight alumina, about 50% to about 98% by weight silica,

Art Unit: 1615

and about 1% to about 5% by weight boron (Col. 3, lines 19-27). The composition further comprises silicon carbide (Col. 15, Claim 16). The density of the composition ranges from 4 lb./ft³ to 62 lb./ft³ (Col. 3, line 44 – Col. 4, line 18). The composition is also highly porous (Col. 3, line 44 – Col. 4, line 18; See also claims 12, 22, and 25). Carbon fibers are also added to the composition (Col. 4, line 60 – Col. 5, line 21). Lyles further teaches that the composition comprises zirconium fibers in addition to the already mentioned fibers (Col. 9, lines 9-15; col. 10, lines 1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 5, 7-11, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyles et al. (US 5621035). The teachings of Lyles are discussed

Art Unit: 1615

above. Lyles does not teach the exact porosity of the composition or the silicon dioxide content on surface of the composition.

While the reference does not teach the complete concentration range or porosity, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a composition comprising silica, alumina and boron with a specific porosity and density. It is the position of the examiner that prior art has obtained this result i.e., a composition with a wide range of density and is highly porous comprising silica, alumina and boron, and that no criticality is seen in applicant's particular porosity ranges or silicon dioxide content. Any distinction is a matter of degree and not of kind.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyles et al. (US 5951295). The teachings of Lyles are discussed above. Lyles does not teach the exact porosity of the composition or the silicon dioxide content on surface of the composition.

Art Unit: 1615

While the reference does not teach the complete concentration range, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a composition comprising silica, alumina and boron with a specific porosity and density. It is the position of the examiner that prior art has obtained this result i.e., a composition with a wide range of density and is highly porous comprising silica, alumina and boron, and that no criticality is seen in applicant's particular porosity ranges or silicon dioxide content. Any distinction is a matter of degree and not of kind.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyles et al. (US 5621035) or Lyles et al. (US 5951295) in view of Markkula et al. (US 6063395). The teachings of the Lyles references are discussed above. Neither Lyles reference teaches the incorporation of a drug.

Markkula teaches an implant drug delivery device comprising silica and a therapeutic active agent (Col. 10, Claims 1-12).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an active agent in the porous composition.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to delivery subcutaneously a drug at a substantially constant rate for a prolonged period of time.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed December 31, 2002 has been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Applicants' argue that the prior art does not teach or suggest a porous composition comprising from about 50% to about 100% cristobalite having a mean pore diameter of about 50 microns to about 600 microns.

The Examiner would like to first point out that the components of the composition and the method of making the composition are the same. Applicants state in the instant Specification that the process of making the composition is taught in U.S. Patent No. 5,951,295. The components or main ingredients of the composition appear to be exactly the same, silica and alumina. Therefore, the Examiner fails to see the difference between the instant claimed composition and the prior art composition when the components and method of making the composition are the same.

As for the concentration of cristobalite, the instant claims recite that the silica comprises from about 50% to about 100% cristobalite. The Examiner fails to see the difference between the instant claimed composition and the prior art composition when the components and method of making the composition are the same. It is not clear

Art Unit: 1615

how the same starting material and methods of preparing the composition can produce two different products. The drying and firing steps of both the instant application and the prior art of record are exactly the same. Therefore, applicants' arguments about the concentration of cristobalite being modified by heating the composition to the maximum temperature quickly are unpersuasive.

Upon a careful examination of the instant Specification and the prior art, it appears that the components of the composition are the same as well as the method of making said composition. Reciting a characteristic of the same composition that was originally not recited in the prior art does not lend itself to patentability. It is still the same composition produced by the same method. It appears that the same composition is produced in the instant application as is produced in the prior art and by the same method. The recitation of the porosity or cristobalite content appears to be a characteristic not recited in the prior art but this characteristic does not render the claims patentable over the prior art.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Joynes whose telephone number is (703) 308-8869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 8:30 - 6:00, alternate Fri. 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1615

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Robert M. Joynes
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1615
November 3, 2003

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600